arXiv:1609.09098v1 [math.CO] 28 Sep 2016

A GENERALIZATION OF THE GRID THEOREM

JIM GEELEN AND BENSON JOERIS

Abstract. A graph has tree-width at most k if it can be obtained from a set of graphs each with at most $k+1$ vertices by a sequence of clique sums. We refine this definition by, for each non-negative integer θ, defining the θ-tree-width of a graph to be at most k if it can be obtained from a set of graphs each with at most $k+1$ vertices by a sequence of clique sums on cliques of size less than θ. We find the unavoidable minors for the graphs with large θ-tree-width and we obtain Robertson and Seymour's Grid Theorem as a corollary.

1. Introduction

We introduce a refinement of tree-width and prove a generalization of Robertson and Seymour's Grid Theorem; see [4]. We start with the statement of our main result which gives an unavoidable-minor characterization of graphs with large "θ-connected sets" and then we relate this to tree-width.

For a non-negative integer θ, a set Z of vertices in a graph G is called *θ-connected* if for each pair (X, Y) of subsets of Z with $|X| = |Y| \leq \theta$, G contains $|X|$ vertex-disjoint paths between X and Y; some of these paths may be edgeless, when $X \cap Y \neq \emptyset$.

Generalized wheels. Next we describe a class of graphs which have large θ-connected sets; see Figure 1.

Let $t, \ell, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $t \geq 1$ and $n \geq 3$. Now let T be a t-vertex tree, let Z be an ℓ-element set, let $\pi : V(T) \to V(T)$ be a permutation, and let $\psi : Z \to V(T)$ be an arbitrary function. Then the *(t, ℓ, n)-wheel defined by* (T, Z, π, ψ) is the graph G constructed as follows:

Department of Combinatorics and Optimization, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Canada

Date: September 30, 2016.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05C40 (Primary), 05C83 (Secondary).

Key words and phrases. connectivity, tree-width, unavoidable minors, grid theorem.

This research was partially supported by a grant from the Office of Naval Research [N00014-10-1-0851].



FIGURE 1. A $(4, 2, 12)$-wheel together with its tree T. Note that the matching between T_{12} and T_1 differs from the matchings between the other copies of T. Also note that z is adjacent to each copy of w while z' is adjacent to each copy of x.

(W_1) Let G_1 be the disjoint union of n copies of T, named $T_1, \dots, T_n$. For each $v \in V(T)$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, let v_i denote the copy of v in T_i.

(W_2) Let G_2 be obtained from G_1 by adding an edge between v_i and v_{i+1} for each $v \in V(T)$ and each $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$.

(W_3) Let G_3 be obtained from G_2 by adding an edge between v_n and $(\pi(v))_1$ for each $v \in V(T)$.

(W_4) Let G be obtained from G_3 by adding Z as a set of isolated vertices and then, for each $z \in Z$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, adding an edge from z to $(\psi(z))_i$.

A $(\theta; n)$-*wheel* is a (t, ℓ, n)-wheel where $2t+\ell = \theta$. In Theorem 2.1 we prove that each $(\theta; n)$-wheel contains a θ-connected set with n vertices. Also note that if $n \geq \theta$ then the complete bipartite graph $K_{\theta,n}$ contains a θ-connected set with n vertices.

Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1.1. *For each $\theta, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\theta \geq 2$ and $n \geq 3$, there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, if G is a graph with θ-tree-width at least m, then G contains either a $K_{\theta,n}$-minor or a $(\theta; n)$-wheel-minor.*

In fact, we prove a slight strengthening of Theorem 1.1, Theorem 9.3. This is obtain as a corollary of Theorem 8.5, which is interesting in its own right—it shows that θ-connected sets gives rise to *subgraphs* in a family closely related to the $(\theta; n)$-wheels. These results appeared in the doctoral dissertation of the second author; see [2].

Oporowski, Oxley, and Thomas [3] found the "unavoidable minors" for large 3-connected graphs and for large internally 4-connected graphs; both of those results can be deduced as corollaries of Theorem 1.1.

Tree-width. We will give the more usual definition of tree-width in terms of tree decompositions in Section 3; for brevity we define tree-width in terms of "clique-sums" here. Let G_1 and G_2 be graphs with a common complete subgraph H. Suppose that $V(G_1) \cap V(G_2) = V(H)$ and that $E(G_1) \cap E(G_2) = E(H)$. Then we refer to the graph $(G_1 \cup G_2) - E(H)$ as the *clique-sum* of G_1 and G_2; the *order* of the sum is $|V(H)|$.

The *tree-width* of a graph G is the smallest integer k such that G can be obtained from a set of graphs each with at most $k+1$ vertices by a sequence of clique-sums. We introduce the following refinement: for a non-negative integer θ, the *θ-tree-width* of G is the smallest integer k such that G can be obtained from a set of graphs each with at most $k+1$ vertices by a sequence of clique-sums of order less than θ.

There is a well-known connection between large tree-width in graphs and the existence of large highly-connected vertex-sets; this connection was first observed by Robertson, Seymour and Thomas [5] and later refined by Diestel, Jensen, Gorbonov and Thomassen [1] who proved that: for each $\omega \in \mathbb{N}$ and each graph G,

(i) if G contains an $(\omega+1)$-connected set of size at least 3ω, then G has tree-width at least ω, and
(ii) conversely, if G has no $(\omega+1)$-connected set of size at least 3ω, then G has tree-width less than 4ω.

We prove the following result which relates large θ-tree-width in a graph to the existence of a large θ-connected set.

Theorem 1.2. *For each integer $\theta \geq 3$, if U is a maximum cardinality θ-connected set in a graph G, and ω is the θ-tree-width of G, then*

$$\omega < |U| \leq \binom{\omega+1}{\theta-1}(\theta-1).$$

In Section 10 we derive Robertson and Seymour's Grid Theorem from Theorem 1.1; our proof of Theorem 1.1 does not make use of the Grid Theorem, and hence provides an alternative proof of the Grid Theorem.

2. Preliminaries

In this section we redefine θ-connected set, tree-width, and θ-tree-width in term of "separations"; these definitions are easily shown to be equivalent to the definitions in the introduction, but are more convenient for our proofs. We also prove that each $(\theta; n)$-wheel contains a θ-connected set with n vertices.

Separations. A *separation* in a graph G is an ordered pair of subgraphs (G_1, G_2) such that $G = G_1 \cup G_2$; the *order* of a separation (G_1, G_2), denoted $\lambda(G_1, G_2)$, is $|V(G_1) \cap V(G_2)|$. For $\theta \in \mathbb{N}$, a θ-separation is a separation of order at most θ. The following submodular inequality is both well-known and easy to prove: if (G_1, G_2) and (H_1, H_2) are separations of G, then $(G_1 \cap H_1, G_2 \cup H_2)$ and $(G_1 \cup H_1, G_2 \cap H_2)$ are both separations of G and

$$\lambda(G_1 \cap H_1, G_2 \cup H_2) + \lambda(G_1 \cup H_1, G_2 \cap H_2) \leq \lambda(G_1, G_2) + \lambda(H_1, H_2).$$

For an integer $\theta \geq 0$, a set Z of vertices in a graph G is called *θ-connected* if $\min\{|U \cap V(G_1)|, |U \cap V(G_2)|\} \leq \lambda(G_1, G_2)$ for each separation (G_1, G_2) of order less than θ in G.

Paths. An *end* of a path P is a vertex of degree at most one in P. An *(X, Y)-path* is a path whose set of ends is $\{x, y\}$, with $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$; note that x and y need not be distinct. Two paths P and P' in a graph G are *internally-disjoint* if each vertex in $P \cap P'$ is an end of both paths.

Rim-transversals. Consider a (t, ℓ, n)-wheel H defined by the tuple (T, Z, π, ψ). The tree T is called the *rim-tree*, the sequence $(T_1, \ldots, T_n)$ is called the *rim-tree-sequence*, and the vertices in Z are called the *hubs* of H. A *rim-transversal* of H is a set $U \subseteq V(H) - Z$ that contains exactly one vertex from each of the trees $T_1, \ldots, T_n$.

Theorem 2.1. *For $t, \ell, n \in \mathbb{N}$, if U is a rim-transversal of a (t, ℓ, n)-wheel H, then U is a $(2t + \ell)$-connected set in H.*

Proof. Let $(T_1, \ldots, T_n)$ be the rim-tree-sequence of H. Consider any $(2t + \ell - 1)$-separation (H_1, H_2) in H. Let $X = V(H_1 \cap H_2)$, let I be the set of integers $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $X \cap V(T_i) = \emptyset$.

Consider any $i, j \in I$. By definition, X is disjoint from T_i and T_j, and, by the definition of the (t, ℓ, n)-wheel H, there exist a family $\mathcal{P}$ of $2t + \ell$ distinct, pairwise internally-disjoint $(V(T_i), V(T_j))$-paths. Then each $x \in X$ is in at most one path of $\mathcal{P}$, and $|X| < |\mathcal{P}|$, so the vertex set $V(T_i \cup T_j)$ is contained in a single connected component of $H - X$.

Hence, up to symmetry, we may assume that $V(T_i) \subseteq V(H_1)$ for each $i \in I$.

For each $u \in U \cap V(H_2)$, $u \in V(T_i)$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, n\} - I$, so $V(T_i) \cap X \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, $|V(H_2) \cap U| \leq |X| = \lambda(H_1, H_2)$. It follows that U is a $(2t + \ell)$-connected set in H. □

Tree decompositions. A *leaf* of a tree T is a degree-one vertex. A *tree-decomposition* of a graph G is a tree T such that $E(G)$ is a subset of the leaves of T; we say that an edge t of G *labels* the leaf t of T. We will refer to the vertices of a tree-decomposition as *nodes*, to avoid confusion with the vertices of G. For a vertex v of G we let $\delta_G(v)$ denote the set of edges of G that are incident with v and let T_v denote the unique minimal subtree of T containing those leaves of T that are labelled by the edges in $\delta_G(v)$. For a node $t \in V(T)$ we define a *bag* $Y_t \subseteq V(G)$ to be the set of all vertices $v \in V(G)$ such that $t \in V(T_v)$. The *width* of a tree-decomposition T is defined as $\max\{|Y_t| - 1 : t \in V(T)\}$. The *tree-width* of a graph G is the minimum width over all tree-decompositions of G.

The *bag* associated with an edge $e = tt'$ of a tree-decomposition T of a graph G, denoted Y_e, is defined as $Y_t \cap Y_{t'}$ and the *adhesion* of e is defined as $|Y_e|$. Let T_1 and T_2 be the components of $T - e$ and, for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let G_i be the subgraph of G induced by the edges of G labeling T_i. Then (G_1, G_2) is a separation of order $|Y_e|$; we refer to this as the separation of G *associated* with e. The *adhesion* of T is defined as $\max\{|Y_e| : e \in E(T)\}$.

For each natural number θ, the *θ-tree-width* of a graph G, denoted $\mathrm{tw}_\theta(G)$, is the minimum width over all tree-decompositions of G of adhesion less than θ.

When there is more than one tree-decomposition under consideration we use $Y_e(T)$ and $Y_v(T)$ to denote the bags Y_e and Y_v. We will use the terms *node-bags* and *edge-bags* to distinguish the two types of bags.

3. Tree-width and highly-connected sets

In this section we prove Theorem 1.2 which shows that a graph G has large θ-tree-width if and only if G has a large θ-connected set.

Theorem 3.1. *For each natural number θ, each graph G contains a tree-decomposition T of adhesion less than θ and width at most $\mathrm{tw}_\theta(G)$ such that each node-bag is a θ-connected set in G.*

Proof. Let $\omega = \mathrm{tw}_\theta(G)$. For a tree-decomposition T of G and for each $k \in \{0, \dots, \omega + 1\}$ we let $n_k(T)$ denote the number of k-element node-bags in T. Choose a tree-decomposition T of G of adhesion less



FIGURE 2. Notation used in the proof of Theorem 3.1.

than θ and width equal to ω such that $(n_{\omega+1}(T), n_\omega(T), \dots, n_0(T))$ is lexicographically minimum. Suppose for contradicting that there is a node of T whose bag is not θ-connected, and among all such nodes we choose $r \in V(T)$ maximizing $|Y_r|$.

For each node $t \in V(T) - \{r\}$, let e_t be the unique edge incident with t such that t and r are in distinct components of $T \setminus e_t$, let T_t be the component of $T \setminus e_t$ that contains t, let A_t be the subgraph of G induced by the edges labelling T_t, and let B_t be the subgraph of G induced by the edges labelling $T - V(T_t)$. Note that (A_t, B_t) is a separation in G of order $|Y_{e_t}| \leq \theta - 1$; see Figure 2.

A subgraph $H \subseteq G$ is said to *nest* in a separation (A, B) of G if either $V(H) \subseteq V(A)$ or $V(H) \subseteq V(B)$.

Recall that the bag Y_r is not θ-connected. Now among all $(\theta - 1)$-separations (G_1, G_2) with $|V(G_1) \cap Y_r| > \lambda(G_1, G_2)$ and $|V(G_2) \cap Y_r| > \lambda(G_1, G_2)$ we choose one minimizing $\lambda(G_1, G_2)$ and, subject to that, we choose one minimizing the number of nodes $t \in V(T) - \{r\}$ for which A_t does not nest in (G_1, G_2). We treat the indices of (G_1, G_2) as elements of the cyclic group $\mathbb{Z}_2$; thus $G_{i+2} = G_i$.

Claim 3.1.1. *For each $t \in V(T) - \{r\}$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_2$,*

$$\lambda(A_t \cap G_i, B_t \cup G_{i+1}) \leq \lambda(A_t, B_t),$$

and if equality holds then A_t nests in (G_1, G_2).

Proof of Claim. Let $t \in V(T) - \{r\}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $i = 1$. Suppose that

$$\lambda(A_t \cap G_1, B_t \cup G_2) \geq \lambda(A_t, B_t).$$

By submodularity,

$$\lambda(A_t \cup G_1, B_t \cap G_2) \leq \lambda(G_1, G_2).$$

Also,

$$|Y_r \cap V(A_t \cup G_1)| \geq |Y_r \cap V(G_1)| > \lambda(G_1, G_2)$$

and, since $Y_r \subseteq V(B_t)$,

$$|Y_r \cap V(B_t \cap G_2)| = |Y_r \cap V(G_2)| > \lambda(G_1, G_2).$$

By the choice of (G_1, G_2),

$$\lambda(A_t \cup G_1, B_t \cap G_2) = \lambda(G_1, G_2)$$

and, by submodularity,

$$\lambda(A_t \cap G_1, B_t \cup G_2) = \lambda(A_t, B_t).$$

Suppose for contradiction that A_t does not nest in (G_1, G_2). Note that A_t nests in $(A_t \cup G_1, B_t \cap G_2)$ so, by the choice of (G_1, G_2), there exists some $t' \in V(T) - \{r\}$ such that $A_{t'}$ nests in (G_1, G_2) but not in $(A_t \cup G_1, B_t \cap G_2)$. Note that $V(A_t) \not\subseteq V(A_{t'})$, or else A_t would nest in (G_1, G_2) as $A_{t'}$ does, and $V(A_{t'}) \not\subseteq V(A_t)$, or else $V(A_{t'}) \subseteq V(A_t \cup G_1)$. Hence, $t \notin V(T_{t'})$ and $t' \notin V(T_t)$, so r separates t from t' in T, and so $V(A_{t'}) \subseteq V(B_t)$. However, $V(A_{t'}) \not\subseteq V(G_1)$, or else $V(A_{t'}) \subseteq V(A_t \cup G_1)$, so, because $A_{t'}$ nests in (G_1, G_2), $V(A_{t'}) \subseteq V(G_2)$. But then $V(A_{t'}) \subseteq V(B_t \cap G_2)$, contradiction. □ (Claim)

Let T_1 and T_2 be disjoint copies of the tree T and for each node $w \in V(T)$ let w_1 and w_2 denote the copies of w in T_1 and T_2 respectively. For each labelled leaf t of T we let $t_1 = t$ if $t \in E(G_1)$ and we let $t_2 = t$ if $t \in E(G_2)$. Now we construct a tree-decomposition T' of G by adding an edge $e_r = r_1 r_2$ to $T_1 \cup T_2$.

Claim 3.1.2. *The adhesion of T' is less than θ.*

Proof of Claim. The edge e_r has adhesion $\lambda(G_1, G_2) < \theta$. By symmetry it suffices to consider edges of T_1 in T'. Let $t \in V(T) - \{r\}$ and let e' denote the copy of the edge e_t in T_1. Note that the adhesion of e' is at most $\lambda(G_1 \cap A_t, G_2 \cup B_t)$ which, by Claim 3.1.1, is at most $\lambda(A_t, B_t) < \theta$. □ (Claim)

Claim 3.1.3. *For each $t \in V(T) - \{r\}$ and each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, we have $|Y_{t_i}(T')| \leq |Y_t(T)|$; moreover, if equality holds then $|Y_{t_j}(T')| \leq \lambda(G_1, G_2)$ for some $j \in \{1, 2\}$.*

Proof of Claim. By symmetry we may assume that $i = 1$. Note that

$$Y_{t_1}(T') - Y_t(T) \subseteq V(A_t) \cap V(G_1) \cap V(G_2) - V(B_t),$$
$$Y_t(T) - Y_{t_1}(T') \supseteq V(A_t) \cap V(B_t) - V(G_1),$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&|Y_{t_1}(T')| - |Y_t(T)| \\
&\quad = |Y_{t_1}(T') - Y_t(T)| - |Y_t(T) - Y_{t_1}(T')| \\
&\quad \leq |V(A_t) \cap V(G_1 \cap V(G_2) - V(B_t)| - |V(A_t) \cap V(B_t) - V(G_1)| \\
&\quad = |V(A_t) \cap V(G_1) \cap V(G_2) - V(B_t)| \\
&\qquad - |V(A_t) \cap V(B_t)| + |V(A_t) \cap V(B_t) \cap V(G_1)| \\
&\quad = |V(A_t) \cap V(G_1) \cap (V(B_t) \cup V(G_2))| - |V(A_t) \cap V(B_t)| \\
&\quad = \lambda(A_t \cap G_1, B_t \cup G_2) - \lambda(A_t, B_t)
\end{aligned}$$

so, by Claim 3.1.1, $|Y_{t_1}(T')| \leq |Y_t(T)|$. Moreover, if $|Y_{t_1}(T')| = |Y_t(T)|$, then, by Claim 3.1.1, there exists $j \in \{1, 2\}$ such that $V(A_t) \subseteq V(G_j)$, which implies that $Y_{t_{j+1}}(T') \subseteq V(G_1) \cap V(G_2)$, and hence $|Y_{t_{j+1}}| \leq \lambda(G_1, G_2)$, as required. □ (Claim)

Claim 3.1.4. *For each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, we have $|Y_{r_i}(T')| < |Y_r(T)|$.*

Proof of Claim. By symmetry we may assume that $i = 1$. By our choice of r and (G_1, G_2) we have $|Y_r(T) \cap V(G_2)| > |V(G_1) \cap V(G_2)|$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
|Y_{r_1}(T') - Y_r(T)| &\leq |V(G_1) \cap V(G_2) - Y_r(T)| \\
&= |V(G_1) \cap V(G_2)| - |Y_r(T) \cap V(G_1) \cap V(G_2)| \\
&< |Y_r(T) \cap V(G_2)| - |Y_r(T) \cap V(G_1) \cap V(G_2)| \\
&= |Y_r(T) - V(G_1)| \\
&\leq |Y_r(T) - Y_{r_1}(T')|.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $|Y_{r_1}(T')| < |Y_r(T)|$. □ (Claim)

By Claims 3.1.1, 3.1.3, and 3.1.4, the tree-decomposition T' of G has adhesion less than θ and width at most ω. By Claim 3.1.4, we have $\max\{|Y_{r_1}(T')|, |Y_{r_2}(T')|\} < |Y_r(T)|$. Let $k \in \{0, \ldots, \omega + 1\}$ be maximum such that there exists $s \in V(T)$ with

$$\max\{|Y_{s_1}(T')|, |Y_{s_2}(T')|\} < |Y_s| = k;$$

thus $k \geq |Y_r| > \lambda(G_1, G_2)$. Consider any node $t \in V(T)$ with $|Y_t(T)| \geq k$ and $\max\{|Y_{t_1}(T')|, |Y_{t_2}(T')|\} = |Y_t|$. By Claim 3.1.3,

$$\min\{|Y_{t_1}(T')|, |Y_{t_2}(T')|\} \leq \lambda(G_1, G_2) < k.$$

Therefore $n_k(T') < n_k(T)$ and $n_l(T') \leq n_l(T)$ for each $l > k$. Thus $(n_{\omega+1}(T'), \ldots, n_0(T'))$ lexicographically precedes $(n_{\omega+1}(T), \ldots, n_0(T))$, contradicting our choice of T. □

For $\theta \in \{1, 2\}$, it is an easy exercise to show that the maximum size of a θ-connected set in a graph G is equal to $\mathrm{tw}_\theta(G) + 1$. Next we will show, for $\theta \geq 3$, if a graph G has a sufficiently large θ-connected set, then G has large θ-tree-width.

Lemma 3.2. *For integers θ and n with $n \geq \theta \geq 3$, if G is a graph with a θ-connected set of size greater than $\binom{n}{\theta-1}(\theta-1)$, then G has θ-tree-width at least n.*

Proof. Let U be a θ-connected set with $|U| > \binom{n}{\theta-1}(\theta-1)$ and let T be a tree-decomposition of G with adhesion less than θ and minimum width. We may choose T so that all leaves are labelled and so that it has no vertices of degree two, and, subject to that, having as many vertices as possible. This choice of T ensures that if t is a vertex of degree at least 4 in G and e and e' are incident with t, then $Y_e \neq Y_{e'}$.

Consider each edge $e = tt'$ of T in turn. Let G_t and $G_{t'}$ be the subgraphs of G induced by the edges labelling the components of $T - e$ that contain the vertices t and t' respectively. Since $(G_t, G_{t'})$ is a $(\theta-1)$-separation of G either $|V(G_t) \cap U| < \theta$ or $|V(G_{t'}) \cap U| < \theta$; in fact, because $|U| \geq 2\theta$, exactly one of $V(G_t) \cap U$ or $V(G_{t'}) \cap U$ has size $\geq \theta$; orient the edge e of T toward the larger of the two sets.

Since this oriented tree has no directed circuits, it has a vertex, say r, whose incident edges are all oriented toward it. Let E_r denote the set of edges incident with r. Since

$$|E_r|(\theta-1) \geq |U| > \binom{n}{\theta-1}(\theta-1),$$

we have $|E_r| > \binom{n}{\theta-1}$. In particular, r has degree at least 4. Note that $Y_r = \bigcup(Y_e : e \in E_r)$ and, by our choice of T, the sets $(Y_e : e \in E_r)$ are pairwise distinct. Therefore $|E_r| \leq \binom{|Y_r|}{\theta-1}$ and hence $|Y_r| \geq n + 1$. So $\mathrm{tw}_\theta(G) \geq n$. □

Combining Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, we get Theorem 1.2.

The following construction shows that the bound $\binom{n}{\theta-1}(\theta-1)$ in Lemma 3.2 is tight: Begin with an empty graph on a vertex set A with $|A| = n$ and let $\mathcal{A}$ denote the set of all $A' \subseteq A$ with $|A'| = \theta - 1$. For each set $A' \in \mathcal{A}$, add a set $B_{A'}$ of $\theta - 1$ new vertices and add an edge between each $a \in A'$ and $b \in B_{A'}$. Let B be the union of the sets $B_{A'}$, over all sets $A' \in \mathcal{A}$. Then $\mathrm{tw}_\theta(G) \leq n - 1$ and B is a θ-connected set of size $\binom{n}{\theta-1}(\theta-1)$.



FIGURE 3. An example of a $(4, 2, 1, 6)$-necklace.

4. Necklaces

Directly constructing generalized-wheel-minors is unwieldy, so we start by constructing a closely related structure, called a *necklace*; see Figure 3.

Let t, s, ℓ and, n be non-negative integers with $t \geq s$ and $n \geq 2$. We denote the additive group on the integers modulo n by $\mathbb{Z}_n$. Let G be a graph and let $N = (\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{M}, Y)$ where $\mathcal{B}$ is a sequence $(B_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n)$ of subgraphs of G, $\mathcal{M} = (M_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n)$ is a sequence of edge sets in G, and $Z \subseteq V(G)$. The *left attachment sequence* of N is the sequence $\mathcal{X} = (X_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n)$ where X_i denotes the set of all vertices in B_i that are incident with an edge in M_{i-1}, for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$. The *right attachment sequence* of N is the sequence $\mathcal{Y} = (Y_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n)$ where Y_i denotes the set of all vertices in B_i that are incident with an edge in M_i, for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$. We call N a (t, s, ℓ, n)-*necklace* in G if it satisfies the following properties:

- (N_1) the subgraphs $(B_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n)$ are pairwise disjoint and are each disjoint from Z,
- (N_2) for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, B_i is connected and non-empty,
- (N_3) for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, the set M_i is a matching where each edge has one end in B_i and one end in B_{i+1},
- (N_4) each of $M_1, \ldots, M_{n-1}$ has size t and M_n has size s,
- (N_5) for each $i \in \{2, \ldots, n-1\}$, there are t vertex-disjoint (X_i, Y_i)-paths in B_i,
- (N_6) for both $i \in \{1, n\}$, there are s vertex-disjoint (X_i, Y_i)-paths in B_i, and

(N_7) $|Z| = \ell$ and every vertex in Z has a neighbour in each of the sets $V(B_1), \dots, V(B_n)$.

We call the graphs in $\mathcal{B}$ the *beads* and the vertices in Z the *hubs* of the necklace. By a $(\theta; n)$-*necklace* we mean a (t, s, ℓ, n)-necklace where $t + s + \ell = \theta$.

We say that a (t, s, ℓ, n)-necklace is *supported by* a set $U \subseteq V(G)$ if each bead contains at least one vertex in U. The following theorem is the main step toward proving our main results, Theorem 8.5 and Theorem 9.3.

Theorem 4.1. *For all non-negative integers θ and n with $n \geq 2$ there is an integer m such that, if G is a graph containing a θ-connected set U of size at least m, then G contains a $(\theta; n)$-necklace supported by U.*

The proof of Theorem 4.1 essentially goes by induction on θ. In Section 5 we find a $(0, 0, \theta, n)$-necklace or a $(1, 0, 0, m)$-necklace with $m \gg n$. Then, in Section 6 and Section 7, we show how to turn the $(1, 0, 0, m)$-necklace into a $(\theta; n)$-necklace.

We conclude this section by defining notation that will be used in subsequent sections.

For brevity, when we say that N is a (t, s, ℓ, n)-necklace we implicitly assume that $N = (\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{M}, Y)$ where $\mathcal{B} = (B_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n)$ and $\mathcal{M} = (M_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n)$, and moreover, we assume that the left and right attachment sequences are $\mathcal{X} = (X_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n)$ and $\mathcal{Y} = (Y_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n)$. Similarly, when N' is a (t', s', ℓ', n')-necklace we implicitly assume that $N' = (\mathcal{B}', \mathcal{M}', Z')$ where $\mathcal{B}' = (B'_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_{n'})$ and $\mathcal{M}' = (M'_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_{n'})$, and that the left and right attachment sequences are $\mathcal{X}' = (X'_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_{n'})$ and $\mathcal{Y}' = (Y'_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_{n'})$. We make similar assumptions for necklaces N'', N^1, N^2, et cetera.

Let N be a (t, s, ℓ, n)-necklace in G. We denote $V(B_1 \cup \cdots \cup B_n) \cup Z$ by $V(N)$. We let $G[N]$ denote the subgraph of G whose vertex set is $V(N)$ and whose edge set is the union of $E(B_1 \cup \cdots \cup B_n)$, $M_1 \cup \cdots \cup M_n$, and the set of all edges with one end in Z and the other end in $V(B_1 \cup \cdots \cup B_n)$.

The *reversal* of N is the (t, s, ℓ, n)-necklace $N' = (\mathcal{B}', \mathcal{M}', Z)$ where, for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, we have $B'_i = B_{n-i+1}$ and $M'_i = M_{n-i}$.

We say that N *supports* a necklace N' if each bead of N' contains a bead of N as a subgraph. Note that this is a transitive relation on necklaces and that, if N' is supported by N and N is supported by a vertex set U, then N' is supported by U as well.

Suppose N is a (t, s, ℓ, m)-necklace in a graph G. Let $(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ be a sequence of numbers with $0 = a_0 < \cdots < a_n = m$. For each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, let B'_i denote the subgraph of G obtained taking the union

of the beads $(B_{a_{i-1}+1}, B_{a_{i-1}+2}, \dots, B_{a_i})$ together with the matchings $(M_{a_{i-1}+1}, M_{a_{i-1}+2}, \dots, M_{a_i-1})$. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, let $M'_i = M_{a_i}$. Finally let $\mathcal{B}'$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ denote the sequences $(B'_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n)$ and $(M'_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n)$, respectively. We call $N' = (\mathcal{B}', \mathcal{M}', Z)$ the *contraction of* N *to* $(a_1, \dots, a_{n-1})$ and we denote it by $N \circ (a_1, \dots, a_{n-1})$. Note that, if $t \neq 0$, then N' is a (t, s, ℓ, n)-necklace in G supported by N.

5. Initial necklace

In this section we prove the base case for the inductive proof of Theorem 4.1. Lemma 5.2 shows that a sufficiently large θ-connected set gives rise to either a $(0, 0, \theta, n)$-necklace or a $(1, 0, 0, m)$-necklace with $m \gg n$.

A connected graph G with $|V(G)| \geq d^n$ must contain either an n-vertex path or a vertex of degree d; the following result is just a refinement of that observation. The bound of d^n is larger than necessary, but this simplifies the proof slightly.

Lemma 5.1. *For positive integers d, n and m with $d \geq 2$, $n \geq 2$ and $m \geq d^n$, if N is a $(0, 0, 0, m)$-necklace in a connected graph G, then either*

(i) there is a $(0, 0, 1, d)$-necklace in G that is supported by N, or
(ii) there is a $(1, 0, 0, n)$-necklace in G that is supported by N.

Proof. Consider a counterexample (d, n, m, N, G) with $|E(G)|$ minimum. By growing each of the beads we may assume that $V(G) = V(N)$. By the minimality of G,

(a) $B_1, \dots, B_m$ are trees,
(b) G is a tree, and
(c) if v is a vertex of G with degree at most two, then v induces a singleton bead in $\mathcal{B}$ (since otherwise we would obtain a smaller counterexample by contracting an edge of $B_1 \cup \cdots \cup B_m$ that is incident with v).

First suppose that G has a vertex z with degree at least d. Let $(B'_1, \dots, B'_d)$ be a sequence of distinct components of $G - v$. Each of $B'_1, \dots, B'_d$ has a vertex that has degree at most one in G, so, by (c), each of $B'_1, \dots, B'_d$ contains a bead of N. Thus $(B'_1, \dots, B'_d)$ is the bead sequence of a $(0, 0, 1, d)$-necklace supported by N. Thus (i) holds.

Suppose now that each vertex in G has degree less than d. Since $|V(G)| > d^n$, G contains an n-vertex path P. Each component of $G \setminus E(P)$ contains a vertex whose degree in G is at most two, so each component of $G \setminus E(P)$ contains a bead of N by (c). These components together with $E(P)$ form a $(1, 0, 0, n)$-necklace in G, so (ii) holds. □

A simple inductive argument now gives a $(0,0,\theta,n)$- or $(1,0,0,p)$-necklace from a sufficiently large θ-connected set.

Lemma 5.2. *There exists a function $f_{5.2} : \mathbb{N}^3 \to \mathbb{N}$ such that, for $\theta, n, p \in \mathbb{N}$, with $n \geq 2$ and $p \geq 2$, if U is a θ-connected set in a graph G with $|U| \geq f_{5.2}(\theta, n, p)$, then either*

(i) G contains a $(0,0,\theta,n)$-necklace supported by U, or
(ii) G contains a $(1,0,0,p)$-necklace whose beads each contain at least θ vertices in U.

Proof. Fix $\theta, n, p \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $m_\theta = n$ and, for $k \in \{0, \dots, \theta - 1\}$, let $m_k = m_{k+1}^{p\theta} + k$. Let $f_{5.2}(\theta, n, p) = m_0$. Let U be a θ-connected set in a graph G with $|U| \geq f_{5.2}(\theta, n, p)$. Note that the singletons of elements in U form a $(0,0,0,m_0)$-necklace; let $k \in \{0, \dots, \theta\}$ be maximal such G contains a $(0,0,k,m_k)$-necklace N supported by U. If $k = \theta$, then (i) holds.

Now suppose $k < \theta$. Let Z be the hub set of N, so $|Z| = k$. Because U is θ-connected, $G - Z$ contains a component G' such that $|U - V(G')| \leq k$. Therefore, $|U \cap V(G')| \geq m_{k+1}^{p\theta}$. By Lemma 5.1, G' contains either a $(0,0,1,m_{k+1})$- or $(1,0,0,p\theta)$-necklace N' supported by N. Each $z \in Z$ is a hub of N', so if N' is a $(0,0,1,m_{k+1})$-necklace, then G contains a $(0,0,k+1,m_{k+1})$-necklace supported by N, and hence supported by U, contradicting our choice of k. Therefore, N' is a $(1,0,0,p\theta)$-necklace. Thus, $N' \circ (\theta, 2\theta, \dots, (p-1)\theta)$ is a $(1,0,0,p)$-necklace in G with each bead containing at least θ vertices in U, so (ii) holds. □

6. Long jumps

In the next two sections we describe how to turn a $(1,0,0,m)$-necklace, with $m \gg n$, into a $(\theta; n)$-necklace.

Let N be a (t,s,ℓ,n)-necklace in a graph G. For $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, an (i,j)-*jump* of N is a $(V(B_i), V(B_j))$-path P which intersects $V(N)$ only at its ends. A *long jump* is an (i,j)-jump where $j - i \notin \{-1, 0, 1\}$; note that a $(1,n)$-jump is not a long jump. If G does not contain a long jump of N, then we say that N is *long-jump-free* in G.

In this section we turn a (t,s,ℓ,m)-necklace, with $t \geq 1$ and $m \gg n$, into either a long-jump-free (t,s,ℓ,n)-necklace or a (t',s',ℓ',n)-necklace with $t' \geq 1$ and $t' + s' + \ell' > t + s + \ell$.

Lemma 6.1. *There exists a function $f_{6.1} : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. Let $t, s, \ell, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $t \geq 1$, $n \geq 2$ and $m \geq f_{6.1}(n)$. If G is a graph containing a (t,s,ℓ,m)-necklace N, then G contains a (t,s,ℓ,n)-necklace N' supported by N such that either*

(i) N' is long-jump-free in G, or
(ii) for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, there is a $(1,i)$-jump for N' in G.

Proof. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For $k \in \{0, \dots, n^2+1\}$, let $m_k = n^{n^2-k+1}$. Let $f_{6.1}(n+2) = m_0 + 2$. Let $t, s, \ell, m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $t \geq s$ and $m \geq f_{6.1}(n+2)$, and let G be a graph containing a (t,s,ℓ,m)-necklace N. It suffices to show that G contains a $(t,s,\ell,n+2)$-necklace N' supported by N such that either (i) N' is long-jump-free or (ii) for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{n+2}$, there is a $(1,i)$-jump for N' in G.

Let S denote the set of all pairs (a,b) such that $1 \leq a \leq b \leq m$ and there exists an (a,b)-jump for N in G. For integers a and b with $a \leq b$ we let $[a,b]$ denote the interval $\{a, a+1, \dots, b\}$. A subset $S' \subseteq S$ is *t-intersecting* if

$$\left| [1,m] \cap \bigcap_{(a,b)\in S'} [a,b] \right| \geq t.$$

Let $S' \subseteq S$ be maximal such that S' is (m_k+2)-intersecting, where $k = |S'|$; note that S' exists because $|[1,m]| \geq m_0 + 2$, so $\emptyset$ is (m_0+2)-intersecting. Let $\{(a_1,b_1), \dots, (a_k,b_k)\} = S'$. Let $a_{\max} = \max\{1, a_1, \dots, a_k\}$, $b_{\min} = \min\{m, b_1, \dots, b_k\}$ and let $I = [a_{\max}, b_{\min}]$, and note that

$$a_{\max} + m_k < a_{\max} + |I| - 1 = b_{\min}.$$

Case 1. $k \leq n^2$.

Then $a_{\max} + n \cdot m_{k+1} < b_{\min}$. Let

$$N' = N \circ (a_{\max}, a_{\max} + m_{k+1}, \dots, a_{\max} + n \cdot m_{k+1}).$$

Thus N' is a $(t,s,\ell,n+2)$-necklace supported by N. By our choice of S, for each $(a,b) \in S - S'$, $|I \cap [a,b]| \leq m_{k+1} + 1$, so $V(B_a) \subseteq V(B'_{a'})$ and $V(B_b) \subseteq V(B'_{b'})$ for some a' and b' with $a' \leq b' \leq a'+1$; for each $(a,b) \in S'$, $V(B_a) \subseteq V(B'_1)$ and $V(B_b) \subseteq V(B'_{n+2})$. Therefore N' is long-jump-free in G and, hence, (i) holds.

Case 2. $k = n^2 + 1$.

Then $\max\{|\{a_1, \dots, a_k\}|, |\{b_1, \dots, b_k\}|\} > n$, so by possibly reversing N, we may assume that $|\{b_1, \dots, b_k\}| \geq n+1$. By possibly relabeling the elements of S', we may assume that $b_1 < b_2 < \cdots < b_{n+1}$. Also note that $a_{\max} < a_{\max} + m_k < b_{\min} \leq b_1$. Let

$$N' = N \circ (a_{\max}, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n).$$

Then N' is a $(t,s,\ell,n+2)$-necklace and, for each $i \in \{2, \dots, n+2\}$, the (a_{i-1}, b_{i-1})-jump in N is a $(1,i)$-jump in N', so (ii) holds. $\square$

We will now treat outcome (ii) of Lemma 6.1. For convenience we will handle the trivial case where $s = 0$ in the following lemma whose proof we omit.

Lemma 6.2. *Let N be a $(t, 0, \ell, n)$-necklace in a graph G with $t \geq 1$. If there is a $(1, n)$-jump of N in G, then G has a $(t, 1, \ell, n)$-necklace supported by N.*

Lemma 6.3. *There exists a function $f_{6.3} : \mathbb{N}^2 \to \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. Let $t, s, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $t \geq s \geq 1$, $n \geq 2$, and $m \geq f_{6.3}(s, n)$. If N is a (t, s, ℓ, m)-necklace in a graph G and there is a $(1, i)$-jump of N for each $i \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$, then there exists a $(t+1, s-1, \ell, n)$- or $(t, s-1, \ell+1, n)$-necklace supported by N in G.*

Proof. Fix $s, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq 2$ and $s \geq 1$. Let

$$f_{6.3}(s, n) = \left(n^{(n-1)^2+1} - 1\right) s + 4.$$

Let $t, m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $t \geq s$ and $m \geq f_{6.3}(s, n)$. Let N be a (t, s, ℓ, m)-necklace in a graph G such that, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$, G contains a $(1, i)$-jump for N.

By possibly growing the bead B_1 we may assume that each $(1, i)$-jump consists of a single edge. For each $i \in \{3, 4, \dots, m-1\}$ let $e_i = x_i y_i$ be an edge with $x_i \in V(B_1)$ and $y_i \in V(B_i)$. There is a collection of vertex-disjoint trees $(T_1, \dots, T_s)$ in B_1 such that $V(B_1) = V(T_1 \cup \cdots \cup T_s)$ and, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, the tree T_i contains a vertex in each of X_1 and Y_1. Then $|\{3, \dots, m-1\}| > \left(n^{(n-1)^2+1} - 1\right) s$, so there is an integer $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ and a set $I \subseteq \{3, \dots, m-1\}$ with $|I| = n^{(n-1)^2+1}$ such that $\{x_i : i \in I\} \subseteq V(T_j)$. Without loss of generality, $j = s$. Let T be the tree obtained from T_s by adding the vertices $\{y_i : i \in I\}$ and the edges $\{e_i : i \in I\}$.

Claim 6.3.1. *There exists a $(0, 0, 1, n)$- or $(1, 0, 0, n)$-necklace N^2 in T and an increasing sequence $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$ of integers in I such that, for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $y_{a_i} \in B_i^2$.*

Proof of Claim. By Lemma 5.1, there is a $(0, 0, 1, n)$- or $(1, 0, 0, (n-1)^2 + 1)$-necklace N^1 in T that is supported by $\{y_i : i \in I\}$.

Suppose that N^1 is a $(0, 0, 1, n)$-necklace. Then any permutation of the beads of N^1 yields another $(0, 0, 1, n)$-necklace. In particular, the beads can be ordered such that $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ exists.

Now suppose that N^1 is a $(1, 0, 0, (n-1)^2 + 1)$-necklace. For $i \in \{1, \dots, (n-1)^2+1\}$, choose $b_i \in I$ such that $y_{b_i} \in V(B_i^1)$. By the Erdős-Szekeres Theorem, $(b_1, \dots, b_{(n-1)^2+1})$ contains a monotonic subsequence $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$. By possibly reversing N, we may assume that $a_1 < \cdots <$



FIGURE 4. Notation used in the proof of Lemma 6.3. The beads of N are shown in light grey, and the beads of N^4 are shown in dark grey.

a_n. By contracting N^1, we obtain a $(1,0,0,n)$-necklace N^2 such that, for $i \in \{1,\dots,n\}$, $y_{a_i} \in V(B_i^2)$. □ (Claim)

Let $N^3 = N \circ (a_1,\dots,a_{n-1})$. Note that, because $a_1 \geq 3$, B_1^3 contains both B_1 and B_2 and, hence, $B_1^3 - V(T_s)$ is connected. For $j \in \{1,\dots,s-1\}$, T_j contains an (X_1,Y_1)-path, so $B_1^3 - V(T_s)$ contains $s-1$ vertex-disjoint (X_1, Y_1^3) paths. Also note that M_n^3 contains exactly one edge, e_s, incident with a vertex in $V(T_s)$. So we can construct a $(t, s-1, \ell, n)$-necklace N^4 by deleting $V(T_s)$ from B_1^3, and deleting e_s from M_n^3. Note that N^4 is supported by N because $B_2 \subseteq B_1^4$. See Figure 4.

Note that, for $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, $V(B_i^2) \cap V(N^4) = \{y_{a_i}\} \subseteq V(B_i^4)$, $Z^2 \cap V(N^4) = \emptyset$, and $M_i^2 \cap E(N^4) = \emptyset$. We construct a $(t, s-1, \ell+1, n)$- or $(t+1, s-1, \ell, n)$-necklace N^5 by merging N^2 with N^4 as follows:

(i) let $Z^5 = Z^2 \cup Z^4$,
(ii) for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, let $B_i^5 = B_i^2 \cup B_i^4$, and
(iii) for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, let $M_i^5 = M_i^2 \cup M_i^4$.

Finally, note that N^5 is supported by N via N^4, as required. □

Finally combining Lemmas 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3 with a routine inductive proof on s (which is omitted) we obtain the following result.

Lemma 6.4. *There exists a function $f_{6.4} : \mathbb{N}^2 \to \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. Let $t, s, m, n, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ with $t \geq 1$, $n \geq 2$ and $m \geq f_{6.4}(s,n)$. If N is a (t,s,ℓ,m)-necklace in a graph G, then there exists a (t', s', ℓ', n)-necklace N' in G supported by N such that $t' \geq 1$, and either*

(i) $t' + s' + \ell' = t + s + \ell$ *and* N' *is long-jump-free in* G*, or*
(ii) $t' + s' + \ell' > t + s + \ell$*.*

7. Long-jump-free necklaces

Henceforth we may assume that we have a long-jump-free (t, s, ℓ, n)-necklace, supported by a θ-connected set U, in a graph G, where $t+s+\ell < \theta$. In this section we show that G contains $(t+1, s, \ell, n')$-necklace or a $(t, s+1, \ell, n')$-necklace (Lemma 7.3), and then complete the proof of Theorem 4.1, as Theorem 7.4.

First, we require the following easy connectivity result.

Lemma 7.1. *Let* $k \in \mathbb{N}$*. Let* $\mathcal{P}$ *be a collection of* k *vertex-disjoint* (X, X')*-paths in a graph* G*, and let* $\mathcal{Q}$ *be a collection of* k *vertex-disjoint* (Y, Y')*-paths in* G*, where* $X, X', Y, Y' \subseteq V(G)$*. Let* $\mathcal{B}$ *be a collection of* k *vertex-disjoint connected subgraphs of a graph* G*, each having non-empty intersection with each path in* $\mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{Q}$*. Then* G *contains* k *vertex-disjoint* (X, Y)*-paths.*

Proof. Consider any set $A \subseteq V(G)$ with $|A| < k$. Since $|\mathcal{B}| = |\mathcal{P}| = |\mathcal{Q}| = k > |A|$, there exist $B \in \mathcal{B}$, $P \in \mathcal{P}$, and $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that $A \cap V(P \cup B \cup Q) = \emptyset$. By the definition of X and Y, we have $X \cap V(P) \neq \emptyset$ and $Y \cap V(Q) \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, since B has a non-empty intersection with both P and Q, the graph $B \cup P \cup Q$ is connected. So there exists an (X, Y)-path in $G - A$. Then, by Menger's Theorem, there are k vertex-disjoint (X, Y)-paths in G. □

The following lemma shows how to exploit excess of paths through a segment of a necklace to increase the structure. This is the key step in Lemma 7.3. The proof of this result incorporates ideas from the short proof of the Grid Theorem due to Diestel, Gorbunov, Jensen, and Thomassen [1].

Lemma 7.2. *There exists a function* $f_{7.2} : \mathbb{N}^3 \to \mathbb{N}$ *such that the following holds. Let* $t, s, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ *with* $t \geq s$*,* $n \geq 2$ *and* $m \geq f_{7.2}(t, s, n)$*. Let* G *be a graph with a* $(0, 0, 0, m)$*-necklace* N *that is long-jump-free and has no* $(1, m)$*-jump. Let* $X \subseteq V(B_1)$ *and* $Y \subseteq V(B_m)$*. Suppose* G *contains* s *vertex-disjoint* $(X, V(B_s))$*-paths,* s *vertex-disjoint* $(V(B_{m-s+1}), Y)$*-paths, and* t *vertex-disjoint* $(V(B_1), V(B_m))$*-paths. Then* G *contains a* $(t, 0, 0, n)$*-necklace* N' *supported by* N *such that* B'_1 *contains* s *vertex-disjoint* (X, X'_1)*-paths and* B'_n *contains* s *vertex-disjoint* (X'_n, Y)*-paths.*

Proof. Fix $t, s, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $t \geq s$ and $n \geq 2$. Let

$$f_{7.2}(t, s, n) = \max\{n\,,\, n(t-1) + 2s - 1\}.$$

Let N be a $(0,0,0,m)$-necklace in a graph G, with $m \geq f_{7.2}(t,s,n)$, let $X \subseteq V(B_1)$, and let $Y \subseteq V(B_n)$. Suppose G contains s vertex-disjoint $(X, V(B_s))$-paths, s vertex-disjoint $(V(B_{m-s+1}), Y)$-paths, and t vertex-disjoint $(V(B_1), V(B_m))$-paths. If $t \leq 1$, then it easy to see that G contains a $(t,0,0,n)$-necklace with the required properties. We now assume $t \geq 2$.

Claim 7.2.1. *There exist sets X' and Y' such that $X' \subseteq V(B_1 \cup B_{s+1})$, $Y' \subseteq V(B_{m-s} \cup B_m)$, $|X' \cap X| = |Y' \cap Y| = s$, $|X'| = |Y'| = t$, and G contains t vertex-disjoint (X', Y')-paths.*

Proof of Claim. Let $(P_1, \ldots, P_t)$ be a collection of vertex-disjoint $(V(B_1), V(B_m))$-paths, and let $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, \ldots, P_s)$. Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a collection of s vertex-disjoint $(X, V(B_s))$-paths in G; because N is long-jump-free and has no $(1,m)$-jump, we may assume each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ is disjoint from $V(B_{s+1} \cup \cdots \cup B_m)$. Similarly, there exists a collection $\mathcal{Q}'$ of s vertex-disjoint $(V(B_{m-s+1}), Y)$-paths in G, each of which is disjoint from $V(B_1 \cup \cdots \cup B_{m-s})$. Let H be the union of the paths in $\mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{Q} \cup \mathcal{Q}'$ together with the beads $B_1, \ldots, B_s$ and $B_{m-s+1}, \ldots, B_m$.

Each path in $\mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{Q}$ intersects each of $B_1, \ldots, B_s$, so by Lemma 7.1, H contains a collection $\mathcal{P}'$ of s vertex-disjoint $(X, V(B_n))$-paths. Similarly, each path in $\mathcal{P}' \cup \mathcal{Q}'$ intersects each of $B_{m-s+1}, \ldots, B_m$, so, by Lemma 7.1, H contains a collection $(P_1'', \ldots, P_s'')$ of vertex-disjoint (X, Y)-paths.

For $k \in \{s+1, \ldots, t\}$, $P_k - V(H)$ contains a $(V(B_{s+1}), V(B_{m-s}))$-path P_k'', because $s+1 \leq m-s$ and N is long-jump-free and has no $(1,m)$-jump. Let x_k be the end of P_k'' in $V(B_{s+1})$ and let y_k be the end of P_k'' in $V(B_{m-s})$. Let $X' = X \cup \{x_{s+1}, \ldots, x_t\}$ and let $Y' = Y \cup \{y_{s+1}, \ldots, y_t\}$. Then, $(P_1'', \ldots, P_t'')$ is a collection of vertex-disjoint (X', Y')-paths, as desired. □ (Claim)

Let G' be the minimal subgraph of G containing $G[N]$, and containing t vertex-disjoint (X', Y')-paths. Let $(P_1, \ldots, P_t)$ be a collection of t vertex-disjoint (X', Y')-paths. For $i \in \{s+2, \ldots, m-s\}$ and $k \in \{1, \ldots, t\}$, let $L_{i,k}$ denote the longest subpath of P_k with an end in X' and disjoint from B_i; let $R_{i,k} = P_k - V(L_{i,k})$. Note that both $L_{i,k}$ and $R_{i,k}$ are non-empty. Let $e_{i,k}$ be the edge in P_k between $L_{i,k}$ and $R_{i,k}$. Let $L_i = \bigcup_{k=1}^{t} L_{i,k}$, and let $R_i = \bigcup_{k=1}^{t} R_{i,k}$.

Claim 7.2.2. *For each $i \in \{s+2, \ldots, m-s\}$ and each $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ with $j \leq i - t + 1$, $V(R_i \cap B_j) = \emptyset$.*

Proof of Claim. Suppose the contrary, so there exists $v \in V(R_{i,k} \cap B_j) \neq \emptyset$, for some k; without loss of generality, $k = 1$. Let u be the end



FIGURE 5. Notation used in the proof of Lemma 7.2.

of $R_{i,1}$ in B_i. Note that $i \neq j$, so the subpath of P_1 between u and v contains some edge, e, that is not in $E(N)$. Let L' denote the subpath of P_1 between X' and u, and let R' denote the subpath of P_1 between v and Y'. See Figure 5. Then $(L', P_2, \dots, P_t)$ and $(R', P_2, \dots, P_t)$ are each collections of vertex-disjoint paths in $G' \setminus e$ with ends in X' and Y', respectively. Moreover, each of the paths $P_2, \dots, P_t$, L', R' intersect each of $B_j, \dots, B_i$, and $|\{B_j, \dots, B_i\}| \geq t$. By Lemma 7.1, $G' \setminus e$ contains t vertex-disjoint (X', Y')-paths, contradicting the choice of G'. □ (Claim)

For $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, let $\alpha(i) = (i-1)(t-1) + s + 1$. Note that $s + 1 = \alpha(1) < \cdots < \alpha(n) \leq m - s$. Let $B'_1 = B_{\alpha(1)} \cup L_{\alpha(2)}$, let $B'_n = B_{\alpha(n)} \cup R_{\alpha(n)}$, and for $i \in \{2, \dots, n-1\}$, let $B'_i = B_{\alpha(i)} \cup (L_{\alpha(i+1)} \cap R_{\alpha(i)})$. For $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, let $M'_i = \{e_{\alpha(i+1),k} : k \in \{1, \dots, t+1\}\}$. For $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, let $Y'_i = V(B'_i \cap M'_i)$ and $X'_{i+1} = V(B'_{i+1} \cap M'_i)$.

Note that $L_{\alpha(i+1)}$ is disjoint from $B_{\alpha(j)}$, for each $j > i$ and, by Claim 7.2.2, $R_{\alpha(i)}$ is disjoint from $B_{\alpha(j)}$, for each $j < i$. Therefore, $B'_1, \dots, B'_n$ is a collection of vertex-disjoint subgraphs. Note also that, for each $k \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and each $i \in \{2, \dots, n-1\}$, $L_{\alpha(i+1),k} \cap R_{\alpha(i),k}$ is an (X'_i, Y'_i)-path intersecting $B_{\alpha(i)}$, so B'_i is connected and contains t vertex-disjoint (X'_i, Y'_i)-paths. Similarly, B'_1 and B'_n are each connected and contain t vertex-disjoint (X', Y'_1)- and (X'_n, Y')-paths, respectively. Hence, $(B'_1, \dots, B'_n)$ and $(M'_1, \dots, M'_{n-1}, \emptyset)$ define a $(t, 0, 0, n)$-necklace N', B'_1 contains s vertex-disjoint (X, Y'_1)-paths and B'_n contains s vertex-disjoint (X'_n, Y)-paths, as desired. □

The following result all but completes the proof of Theorem 4.1.

Lemma 7.3. *There exists a function $f_{7.3} : \mathbb{N}^3 \to \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. Let $t, s, \ell, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $t \geq 1$, $n \geq 2$ and $m \geq f_{7.3}(t, s, n)$. Now let N be a long-jump-free (t, s, ℓ, m)-necklace in a graph G. If, for each $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_m$, there exist $(t + s + \ell + 1)$ vertex-disjoint $(V(B_a), V(B_b))$-paths in G, then there is a $(t+1, s, \ell, n)$- or $(t, s+1, \ell, n)$-necklace in G supported by N.*

Proof. Let $t, s, \ell, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $t \geq s$, $t \geq 1$, $n \geq 2$. Let

$$m_1 = \max\{f_{7.2}(t+1, t, n)\,,\ f_{7.2}(s+1, s+1, 2)\,,\ 2s+2\,,\ n\}.$$

Let $a = s + 1$, let $b = s + m_1$, and let $f_{7.3}(t, s, n) = 2m_1 - 2$. Now let N be a long-jump-free (t, s, ℓ, m)-necklace in a graph G with $m \geq f_{7.3}(t, s, n)$ such that G contains $t + s + \ell + 1$ vertex-disjoint paths between any two beads; in particular, G contains $t + s + \ell + 1$ vertex-disjoint $(V(B_a), V(B_b))$-paths. By contracting N, we may assume that $m = 2m_1 - 2$.

Let $G' = G - Z$ and $N' = (\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{M}, \emptyset)$. Note that G' contains $t + s+1$ vertex-disjoint $(V(B_a), V(B_b))$-paths and that a $(t', s', 0)$-necklace supported by N' in G' gives a (t', s', ℓ)-necklace supported by N in G. Therefore, we may assume $\ell = 0$.

Since N is long-jump-free in G, there is a separation (G_1, G_2) of G such that

(i) $G_1 \cap G_2 = B_a \cup B_b$,
(ii) $B_a \cup B_{a+1} \cup \cdots \cup B_b$ is a subgraph of G_1, and
(iii) $B_1 \cup B_2 \cup \cdots \cup B_a$ and $B_b \cup B_{b+1} \cup \cdots \cup B_m$ are subgraphs of G_2.

Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a collection of $t+s+1$ vertex-disjoint $(V(B_a), V(B_b))$-paths; we may assume that each path in $\mathcal{P}$ meets $V(B_a \cup B_b)$ in only its ends. Therefore each path in $\mathcal{P}$ is contained in either G_1 or G_2; let $\mathcal{P}_1$ denote the set of paths in $\mathcal{P}$ that are contained in G_1 and let $\mathcal{P}_2$ denote the set of paths in $\mathcal{P}$ that are contained in G_2. Since $|\mathcal{P}| = t+s+1$, either $|\mathcal{P}_1| > t$ or $|\mathcal{P}_2| > s$.

Case 1. $|\mathcal{P}_1| > t$.

Note that, $(B_a, \ldots, B_b)$ is the bead sequence of a $(t, 0, 0, m_1)$-necklace in G_1 that is long-jump-free and has no $(1, m_1)$-jump. Moreover, considering the necklace N, we see that G_1 contains t vertex-disjoint $(X_a, V(B_{a+t-1}))$-paths and t vertex-disjoint $(V(B_{b-t+1}), Y_b)$-paths. Since $m_1 \geq f_{7.2}(t+1, t, n)$, Lemma 7.2 shows that G_1 contains a $(t+1, 0, 0, n)$-necklace N' supported by N, B'_1 contains t vertex-disjoint (X_a, Y'_1)-paths, and B'_n contains (X'_n, Y_b)-paths.

By considering the necklace N, we see that $G[V(B_1 \cup \cdots \cup B_a)]$ contains s vertex-disjoint (X_1, X_a)-paths, each intersecting G_1 only at the end in X_a; adding these paths to B'_1 yields a connected subgraph with s vertex-disjoint (X_1, Y'_1)-paths. Similarly, B'_n can be extended to contain s vertex-disjoint (X'_n, Y_m)-paths, yielding a $(t + 1, s, 0, n)$-necklace supported by N.

Case 2. $|\mathcal{P}_2| > s$.

If $s = t$, then, because $a + m - b = b - a$, the indices of N can be shifted so that G_1 and G_2 are swapped, reducing to Case 1. We therefore assume that $s < t$.

Note that $(B_b, \dots, B_m, B_1, \dots, B_a)$ is the bead sequence of a $(0,0,0,m_1)$-necklace in G_2 that is long-jump-free and has no $(1,m_1)$-jump. Note that $a - s = 1$ and $b + s \leq m$, so, considering the necklace N, G_2 contains $s+1$ vertex-disjoint $(X_b, V(B_{b+s}))$-paths and $s+1$ vertex-disjoint $(V(B_{a-s}), Y_a)$-paths. Since $m_1 \geq f_{7.2}(s+1, s+1, 2)$, Lemma 7.2 shows that G_2 contains a $(s+1,0,0,2)$-necklace N'' supported by N, B_1'' contains $s+1$ vertex-disjoint (X_b, Y_1')-paths, and B_2'' contains $s+1$ vertex-disjoint (X_2', Y_a)-paths. Then $(B_2'', B_{a+1}, \dots, B_{b-1}, B_1'')$ is the bead sequence of a $(t, s+1, 0, m_1)$-necklace supported by N; since $m_1 \geq n$, a $(t, s+1, 0, n)$-necklace can be obtained by contraction. □

We can now prove Theorem 4.1 which we restate below.

Theorem 7.4. *There exists a function $f_{7.4} : \mathbb{N}^2 \to \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. Let $\theta, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq 2$ and $m \geq f_{7.4}(\theta, n)$. If G is a graph containing a θ-connected set U of size at least m, then G contains a $(\theta; n)$-necklace supported by U.*

Proof. Fix $\theta, n \in \mathbb{N}$, and define

$$f_{7.4}(\theta, n) = f_{5.2}(\theta, n, g(1,0,0)),$$

where, for $t, s, \ell, k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$g(t,s,\ell) = \begin{cases} n & \text{if } t+s+\ell \geq \theta, \\ f_{6.4}(s, f_{7.3}(t, s, h(t+s+\ell+1))) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$h(k) = \max\{g(t', s', \ell') \,:\, t', s', \ell' \in \mathbb{N},\, t' \geq 1,\, t' + s' + \ell' = k\}.$$

Note that this mutual recurrence is strictly decreasing in $\theta - t - s - \ell$, and hence well defined. Let G be a graph with a θ-connected set U of size at least $f_{7.4}(\theta, n)$.

By Lemma 5.2, G contains either a $(0,0,\theta,n)$-necklace supported by U or a $(1,0,0,g(1,0,0))$-necklace such that each bead contains at least θ vertices in U. In the former case, G contains a $(\theta; n)$-necklace as required. Suppose now that G contains a $(1,0,0,g(1,0,0))$-necklace N^0 supported by U.

Let $t, s, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $t \geq 1$, G contains a $(t, s, \ell, g(t,s,\ell))$-necklace N supported by N^0 and, subject to this, $t + s + \ell$ is maximized. We may assume that $t + s + \ell < \theta$.

Let $m'' = h(t + s + \ell + 1)$, let $m' = f_{7.3}(t, s, m'')$, and let $m = f_{6.4}(s, m')$. Note that $m' = g(t, s, \ell)$. Note also that $m' \geq m''$ because the hypothesis of Lemma 7.3 is satisfied for some graph H and and some (t, s, ℓ, m')-necklace in H, so H contains a $(t+1, s, \ell, m'')$- or $(t, s+1, \ell, m'')$-necklace supported by a (t, s, ℓ, m')-necklace.

By Lemma 6.4, G contains a (t', s', ℓ', m')-necklace N' supported by N such that $t' \geq 1$, $t'+s'+\ell' \geq t+s+\ell$ and, if equality holds, then N' is long-jump-free. If $t'+s'+\ell' > t+s+\ell$, then, by deleting some edges, we may assume $t'+s'+\ell' = t+s+\ell+1$; because $m' \geq m'' \geq g(t', s', \ell')$, G contains a $(t', s', \ell', g(t', s', \ell'))$-necklace supported by U, contradicting our choice of t, s, ℓ.

Suppose now that $t' + s' + \ell' = t + s + \ell$, and N' is long-jump-free. Note that, for $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{m'}$, $V(B'_a)$ and $V(B'_b)$ each contain θ vertices in U, so G contains θ vertex-disjoint $(V(B'_a), V(B'_b))$-paths. By Lemma 7.3, G contains a $(t' + 1, s', \ell', m'')$- or $(t', s' + 1, \ell', m'')$-necklace. However, $m'' \geq \max\{g(t' + 1, s', \ell'), g(t', s' + 1, \ell')\}$, contradicting our choice of t, s, ℓ. □

8. Nearly-balanced necklaces

A (t, s, ℓ, n)-necklace N is *balanced* if $s = t$; the necklace N is *nearly-balanced* if either N is balanced or $s = t - 1$ and $\ell = 0$. We show in this section that a $(\theta; m)$-necklace gives rise to a nearly-balanced $(\theta; n)$-necklace in the same graph; the same is not generally true of balanced necklaces—if θ is odd, then any balanced $(\theta; n)$-necklace must have at least one hub, which must have degree at least n, so graphs with maximum degree less than n do not have any balanced $(\theta; n)$-necklace. In the next section we show that a $(\theta; m)$-necklace does give rise to a balanced $(\theta; n)$-necklace in a minor of the original graph.

The following lemma shows that certain jumps can be used to increase s, the size of the matching between the first and last bead. Such jumps will arise in two different ways, depending on whether our necklace has a hub (Lemma 8.2) or not (Lemma 8.3).

Lemma 8.1. *For $t, s, \ell, n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $t > s$, $n \geq 2$ and $m \geq n + 2s$, if N is a (t, s, ℓ, m)-necklace with an $(s + 1, s + n)$-jump in a graph G, then G contains a $(t, s + 1, \ell, n)$-necklace supported by N.*

Proof. By contracting N, we may assume $m = n + 2s$. By growing the beads of N, we may assume that G contains an $(s + 1, s + n)$-jump consisting of exactly one edge, e, incident with a vertex $x \in V(B_{s+1})$ and a vertex in $y \in V(B_{s+n})$. Let

$$N' = N \circ (s + 1, s + 2, \ldots, s + n - 1).$$

Now we construct N'' from N' by adding e to M_n. Let $\mathcal{X}'' = (X''_1, \ldots, X''_n)$ and $\mathcal{Y}'' = (Y''_1, \ldots, Y''_n)$ be the left and right attachment sequences for N''.

We claim that N'' is a $(t, s + 1, \ell, n)$-necklace in G. By The only non-trivial details that need to be verified are:

(1) there are $s+1$ vertex-disjoint (X_1'', Y_1'')-paths in B_1'', and
(2) there are $s+1$ vertex-disjoint (X_n'', Y_n'')-paths in B_n''.

Note that $X_1'' = X_1 \cup \{x\}$, $Y_1'' = Y_{s+1}$, $X_n'' = X_{s+n}$ and $Y_n'' = Y_m \cup \{y\}$. Note also that $m - (s+n) = s$, so reversing N and swapping x and y reduces (2) to (1). Therefore, it suffices to prove (1).

Considering the necklace N, B_1'' contains a collection $\mathcal{P}$ of t vertex-disjoint (Y_1, Y_{s+1})-paths such that, for each $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and each $i \in \{2, \dots, s+1\}$, $P \cap B_i$ is an (X_i, Y_i)-path. Choose $P_0 \in \mathcal{P}$ such that B_{s+1} contains an $(x, V(B_{s+1} \cap P_0))$-path P' disjoint from each path in $\mathcal{P} - P_0$. Let P_0' be an (x, Y_{s+1})-path in $P' \cup P_0 \cap B_{s+1}$. Because $t > s$, there exist distinct paths $P_1, \dots, P_s \in \mathcal{P} - \{P_0\}$.

Considering the necklace N again, B_1'' contains a collection $(Q_1, \dots, Q_s)$ of vertex-disjoint (X_1, X_s)-paths, each intersecting each of $B_1, \dots, B_s$, and each disjoint from B_{s+1}. Let $H = \bigcup_{i=1}^{s}(B_i \cup P_i \cup Q_i)$. By Lemma 7.1, H contains a collection $(P_1', \dots, P_s')$ of vertex disjoint (X_1, Y_{s+1})-paths. Moreover, $V(H \cap P_0') = \emptyset$, so $(P_0', \dots, P_s')$ is a collection of $s+1$ vertex-disjoint $(X_1 \cup \{x\}, Y_{s+1})$-paths. Hence (1) holds. □

Note that a hub can be turned into a jump between any two beads, so Lemma 8.1 immediately implies that a hub can be used to increase s, the size of the matching between the first and last bead.

Lemma 8.2. *Let $t, s, \ell, n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $t > s$, $\ell \geq 1$, $n \geq 2$ and $m \geq n + 2s$. If N is a (t, s, ℓ, m)-necklace in a graph G, then there is a $(t, s+1, \ell-1, n)$-necklace in G that is supported by N.*

The following result handles unbalanced necklaces without hubs; in this case we remove from the necklace one of the t paths through the beads $B_1, \dots, B_n$. This path gives a jump between any two beads, allowing Lemma 8.1 to be applied. This is also used in the next section, where the path is contracted to form a new hub.

Lemma 8.3. *There exists a function $f_{8.3} : \mathbb{N}^2 \to \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. Let $t, s, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $t > s$, $t + s \geq 2$, $n \geq 2$ and $m \geq f_{8.3}(t, n)$. If N is a $(t, s, 0, m)$-necklace supported by a set U of vertices in a graph G, then G contains a $(t-1, s, 0, n)$-necklace N' supported by U, and a path P such that $V(P) \cap V(N') = \emptyset$ and, for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, G contains an edge between $V(B_i')$ and $V(P)$.*

Proof. Let $t, s, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $t > s$, $t + s \geq 2$, and $n \geq 2$. Let $f_{8.3}(t, n) = t(n-1) + 1$, and let $m \geq f_{8.3}(t, n)$. Let N be a $(t, s, 0, m)$-necklace supported by a vertex set U in a graph G.

Let $P_1, \dots, P_t$ be a collection of vertex-disjoint (X_1, Y_m)-paths in $G[N] \setminus M_m$. Note that, for $i \in \mathbb{Z}_m$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, $P_k \cap B_i$ is an

(X_i, Y_i)-path. If $B_i - V(P_k)$ contains a connected component B' such that, for $j \in \{1, \dots, t\} - \{k\}$, $V(P_j \cap B_i) \subseteq V(B')$ and $U \cap V(B') \neq \emptyset$, then we say that P_k is *removable at* i.

Claim 8.3.1. *For each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_m$, there exists $k \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ such that P_k is removable at i.*

Proof of Claim. Fix $i \in \mathbb{Z}_m$ and choose $u \in U \cap V(B_i)$. For $k \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, let (H_1^k, H_2^k) be a separation in B_i such that $H_1^k \cap H_2^k = P_k \cap B_i$, $u \in V(H_1^k)$, and $H_1^k - V(P_j)$ is connected (but possibly empty). Note that $2t > t + s \geq 2$, so $t > 1$. Therefore, $u \notin V(P_k)$ for some $k \in \{1, \dots, t\}$. Choose $k \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ such that $u \notin V(P_k)$ and $V(H_1^k)$ is maximal. Suppose for contradiction that P_k is not removable at i, so there exists $j \in \{1, \dots, t\} - \{k\}$ such that $V(P_j \cap B_i) \not\subseteq V(H_1^k)$. Since $P_j \cap B_i$ is connected and disjoint from $V(H_1^k \cap H_2^k)$, $V(P_j \cap B_i) \subseteq V(H_2^k) - V(H_1^k)$. Therefore, $H_1^k \cup (P_k \cap B_i)$ is a connected subgraph of $B_i - V(P_j)$ containing u, so $u \notin V(P_j)$ and $V(H_1^k) \subseteq V(H_1^k \cup (P_k \cap B_i)) \subsetneq V(H_1^j)$, contradicting the choice of k. □ (Claim)

Therefore, there exist $k \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and a set $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}$ with $|I| \geq n$ such that for each $i \in I$, P_k is removable at i; without loss of generality, $k = t$. Let $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ be an increasing sequence of integers in I. Let P be the subpath of P_t between X_{a_1+1} and Y_{a_n-1}. For $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, let $\{e_i\} = E(M_{a_i} \cap P_t)$. Let $N' = N \circ (a_1, \dots, a_{n-1})$. Let $B_1'' = B_1'$, let $B_n'' = B_n'$. For $i \in \{2, \dots, n-1\}$, P_t is removable at i in N'; let B_i'' be the component of $B_i' - V(P)$ containing $P_j \cap B_i'$, for each $j \in \{1, \dots, t-1\}$, and containing a vertex in U. For $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, let $M_i'' = M_i' - \{e_i\}$. Then $N'' = ((B_1'', \dots, B_n''), (M_1'', \dots, M_n''), \emptyset)$ is a $(t-1, s, 0, n)$-necklace supported by U. Finally, e_1 is an edge between $V(P)$ and $V(B_1'')$, e_{n-1} is an edge between $V(P)$ and $V(B_n'')$ and for $i \in \{2, \dots, n-1\}$, B_i' contains an edge between $V(P)$ and $V(B_i'')$. □

The path extracted by Lemma 8.3 gives a jump between any two beads. By Lemma 8.1, such a jump can be used to increase s, implying the following:

Lemma 8.4. *Let $t, s, m, n, \in \mathbb{N}$ with $t \geq s + 2$, $n \geq 2$ and $m \geq f_{8.3}(t, n + 2s)$. If N is a $(t, s, 0, m)$-necklace supported by a set U in a graph G, then there is a $(t-1, s+1, 0, n)$-necklace in G supported by U.*

Lemmas 8.2 and 8.4, together with a routine inductive argument on $(t - s)$ (which we omit), show that a (t, s, ℓ, m) necklace gives rise to a nearly-balanced $(t + s + \ell; n)$-necklace. Combined with Theorem 7.4,

this proves the following, showing that large θ-connected sets give rise to nearly-balanced $(\theta; n)$-necklaces.

Theorem 8.5. *There exists a function $f_{8.5} : \mathbb{N}^2 \to \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. Let $\theta, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq 2$. If U is a θ-connected vertex set in a graph G and $|U| \geq f_{8.5}(\theta, n)$, then G contains a nearly-balanced (θ, n)-necklace supported by U.*

In some applications, this result may be more useful than Theorem 9.3 because the necklace is a subgraph, rather than a minor.

9. Generalized wheel-minors from necklaces

The penultimate step of the proof is to find a balanced $(\theta; n)$-necklace in a minor of G. The final step, getting a generalized wheel from a balanced necklace, is straightforward.

A "retract" of G is a special kind of contraction-minor in which we take greater care of vertex labels. If $e = xy$ is an edge of a graph G, then the *retraction of e to x in G* is the graph obtained by contracting e to the vertex x; so there are two ways of retracting a non-loop edge. A *retract* of G is any graph obtained from G by a, possibly empty, sequence of edge retractions. Therefore, if H is a retract of G, then $V(H) \subseteq V(G)$. A graph H is a *retraction-minor* of a graph G if H is a subgraph of a retract of G.

A (t, s, ℓ, n)-necklace N is *refined* if each bead is a tree with $\max\{1, t\}$ vertices. Given a refined (t, s, ℓ, n)-necklace N we will assume, for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, that $V(B_i) = \{x_{i,1}, \ldots, x_{i,t'}\}$ and, for $i \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$, that $M_i = \{x_{i,1}x_{i+1,1}, \ldots, x_{i,t'}x_{i+1,t'}\}$, where $t' = \max\{1, t\}$.

We omit the routine proof of the following result.

Lemma 9.1. *If N is a (t, s, ℓ, n)-necklace supported by a set U of vertices in a graph G, then there is a retract H of G and a refined (t, s, ℓ, n)-necklace supported by U in H.*

The following result gives a balanced necklace in a minor.

Lemma 9.2. *There exists a function $f_{9.2} : \mathbb{N}^2 \to \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. Let $\theta, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq 2$. If G is a graph with a θ-connected set U of size at least $f_{9.2}(\theta, n)$, then there is a retract H of G containing a balanced $(\theta; n)$-necklace supported by U.*

Proof. Fix $\theta, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and define

$$g(\theta, n) = \max\{n, f_{8.3}(\lfloor \theta/2 \rfloor, n)\}$$
$$f_{9.2}(\theta, n) = f_{8.5}(\theta, g(\theta, n)).$$

Let G be a graph with a θ-connected set U of size at least $f_{9.2}(\theta, n)$. By Theorem 8.5, G contains a nearly-balanced $(t, s, \ell, g(\theta, n))$-necklace N supported by U with $t + s + \ell = \theta$. If N is balanced, then G itself contains a balanced $(\theta; n)$-necklace. Suppose N is not balanced, so N is a $(s+1, s, 0, g(\theta, n))$-necklace. By Lemma 8.3, G contains $(s, s, 0, n)$-necklace N' supported by U and a path P such that $V(P) \cap V(N') = \emptyset$ and each bead in N' is adjacent to a vertex in P. Let H be the retract-minor of G obtained contracting $E(P)$ to some vertex $z \in V(P)$. Then N' is a necklace supported by U in H, and z is adjacent to each bead of N', so H contains an $(s, s, 1, n)$-necklace supported by U. □

The main result of the paper is:

Theorem 9.3. *There exists a function $f_{9.3} : \mathbb{N}^2 \to \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. Let $\theta, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\theta \geq 2$ and $n \geq 3$. If G is a graph with a θ-connected set U of size at least $f_{9.3}(\theta, n)$, then G has a retraction minor H such that either*

(i) H is isomorphic to $K_{\theta,n}$ with an independent set of size n contained in U, or
(ii) H is a $(\theta; n)$-wheel with a rim-transversal contained in U.

Proof. Fix $\theta, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Define $m = (n-1)\lfloor \theta/2 \rfloor^{\lfloor \theta/2-2 \rfloor} + 1$, and define $f_{9.3}(\theta, n) = f_{9.2}(\theta, m)$. Let U be a θ-connected vertex set in a graph G with $|U| \geq f_{9.3}(\theta, n)$.

By Lemmas 9.2 and 9.1, there is a retract H_1 of G and a refined (t, t, ℓ, m)-necklace N of H_1 that is supported by U with $2t + \ell = \theta$. If $t = 0$, then each bead of N contains exactly one vertex, which is in U, so $H_1[N]$ is a complete bipartite graph satisfying (i). We now assume that $t > 0$.

For each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, we let T_i be an isomorphic copy of B_i obtained by "renaming" vertex $x_{i,j}$ as x_j, for $j \in \{1, \ldots, t\}$. Since there are t^{t-2} trees on the vertex set $\{x_1, \ldots, x_t\}$, and $(n-1)t^{t-2} < m$ there is a n-element set $I \subseteq \{1, \ldots, m\}$ such that the trees $(T_i : i \in I)$ are all equal. It is now routine to obtain the (θ, n)-wheel required in (ii). □

10. The Grid Theorem

We conclude by proving Robertson and Seymour's Grid Theorem using Theorem 9.3.

Theorem 10.1 (Grid Theorem)**.** *For each natural number n there exists a natural number m such that, if G is a graph containing an m-connected set of size at least m, then G contains an $n \times n$-grid-minor.*

Proof. Define $\theta = 2 \cdot n^{2n} + n^2$ and $m = f_{9.3}(\theta, n^2)$. Let G be a graph with an m-element m-connected set. Since the $n \times n$-grid is a subgraph of K_{n^2,n^2}, we may assume that G has no K_{n^2,n^2}-minor. Then, by Theorem 9.3, G has a (t, ℓ, n^2)-wheel H as a minor, where $2t + \ell = \theta$. Suppose that the wheel H is defined by (T, Z, π, ψ). Since G has no K_{n^2,n^2}-minor, $\ell < n^2$ and, hence, $t > n^{2n}$.

We may assume that T does not contain an n-vertex path, since otherwise H would contain a subgraph isomorphic to the $n \times n$-grid. Since $|V(T)| = t > (n^2)^n$, there is a vertex of v degree at least n^2 in T. Now, contracting the edges $u_i u_{i+1}$ for each neighbour u of v in T and each $i \in \{1, \ldots, n^2 - 1\}$, we obtain a K_{n^2,n^2}-minor; this contradiction completes the proof. □

References

[1] Reinhard Diestel, Tommy R. Jensen, Konstantin Yu. Gorbunov, and Carsten Thomassen. Highly Connected Sets and the Excluded Grid Theorem. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 75(1):61–73, January 1999.

[2] Benson Joeris. *Connectivity, tree-decompositions and unavoidable-minors*. PhD thesis, University of Waterloo, 2015.

[3] Bogdan Oporowski, James Oxley, and Robin Thomas. Typical subgraphs of 3- and 4-connected graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 57(2):239–257, 1993.

[4] Neil Robertson and Paul Seymour. Graph minors. V. Excluding a planar graph. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 41:92–114, 1986.

[5] Neil Robertson, Paul D. Seymour, and Robin Thomas. Quickly excluding a planar graph. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 62:323–348, 1994.